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Student Support Unit Assessment Panel

• Facilitator
  • Anne Lundquist, Division of Students Affairs

• Presenters:
  • Kate Bates, Student Activities and Leadership Programs
  • Laura Darrah, Residence Life
  • Dianna Sachs, University Libraries

Assessment at University Libraries

Dianna Sachs
Instructional Services Librarian
dianna.sachs@wmich.edu
Why Assess?

• What is working as intended, what is not?
• What can work better?
• Clarify objectives
• Evidence-based and outcomes-based decision making
• Not to judge individuals

What to Assess?

• Students
• Faculty
• Staff
• Library employees
• Community
• Learning
• Teaching
• Research
• Satisfaction
• Recruitment/Retention
How to Assess?

- Direct/Indirect
- Short-term/Long-term
  - Surveys
  - Interviews
  - Focus Groups
  - Pre/Post Assessments
  - Analysis of Student Work
  - Usability Studies
  - Usage Data

Student Feedback on Instruction

- Assessment: Survey and open-ended feedback
- Found: Over 90% agree that instruction “will make it easier to complete assignment.” Suggestions for improving specific classes
- Result: Good individual-level feedback, limited applicability for global assessment
LibQUAL+

- Assessment: Triennial “perception” survey
- Found: Overall satisfaction, but areas need improvement
- Result: “Low hanging fruit” and communicate responsiveness

Faculty Attitudes

- Assessment: Surveyed faculty
  - Perception of student research ability?
  - Perception of library research instruction?
- Found: Preference for online or short in-class research instruction; High value on student info. lit./research ability
- Result: Emphasis on these options in outreach; Higher use
Online Tutorials

- Assessment: Students complete “old” or “new” info. lit. tutorial; Complete quiz, mock research project; Focus groups
- Found: Student learning similar; Students preferred newer tutorial
- Result: Continue to update tutorial based on student feedback; Continue to assess student success
- *Next update coming this fall

Information Literacy in Health Sciences

- Assessment: Students pass placement exam or 1-credit course; Review info. lit. demonstrated in subsequent research/writing course
- Current: Gathering data, establish baseline for long-term comparison
Lessons Learned

• Start small and simple
• Know your desired outcomes
• Close the loop! Gather data, implement change, assess again

WMU Libraries

Dianna E. Sachs
dianna.sachs@wmich.edu

• http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/library_pubs/
Using National Benchmarking Data for Affirmation, Improvement and Change

Benchmarking Instruments

**EBI → now called Skyfactor**
- Residence Life – Residence Halls; Staff; Apartments
- College Union/Student Center
- Campus Climate/Diversity – Student; Faculty/Staff
- Student Activities – Activities; Leadership; Greek Life
- Career Services Assessment
- Counseling Assessment
- Recreation Services Assessment
- Academic Advising
- First Year Initiative (FYI) Assessment

www.skyfactor.com

**NASPA Consortium → facilitated via Campus Labs**
- Career and Professional Aspirations
- Mental Health and Counseling
- Student Unions and Programming
- Fraternity and Sorority Life
- Campus Recreation
- Campus Activities and Student Involvement
- Residence Life
- Orientation and New Student Programs
- Student Conduct

www.naspaconsortium.org/
Survey Says!

EBI 2012-13

- 2 instruments – halls + apartments
- Data reported in three constructs
  - Satisfaction – 9 factors
  - Learning – 7 factors
  - Overall – 3 factors

- Halls - comparative groups
  - Select 6: CMU, NMU, Ohio Univ, Kent State, Oakland, Wayne State
  - Carnegie Classification – high research activity: 34 institutions
  - All: 250 institutions

- Apartments - comparative groups
  - Select 6: Kansas State, Michigan Tech, NMU, Oakland, Univ. of IL Springfield, Wayne State
  - Carnegie Classification – high research activity: 6 institutions
  - All: 65 institutions
EBI 2012-13 Results – Performance Indicators

Performance Indicators - Halls

Performance Indicators - Apartments

EBI 2012-13 Results – Indicator Factors

Strengths/Weaknesses - With which aspects of the experience are Western Michigan University students most and least satisfied?

Learning

Factors: Western Michigan University (number responding = 760)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Learning</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Fellow Residents are friendly</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Direct Interactions - 3rd Predictor</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Sense of Community - 3rd Predictor</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Fellow Residents are Respectful - 4th Predictor</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Personal Growth</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Personal Interactions - 2nd Predictor</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Manage Time, Study, Solve Problems - 1st Predictor</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Your institution has a higher mean than the goal (5.5).
- Your institution is within .25 of the goal (5.0).
- Your institution has a lower mean than the goal (5.5) by more than .25.
### EBI 2012-13 Results – External Benchmarks

#### Satisfaction

Population: Western Michigan University (Number Responding = 1735)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Description</th>
<th>Peer Institutions</th>
<th>Carnegie Class 2</th>
<th>All Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction: Hallquist Student Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction: Hallquist Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction: Room/Floor Environment - 7th Predictor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction: Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction: Services Provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction: Room Assignment or Change Process - 8th Predictor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction: Safety and Security - 8th Predictor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction: Dining Services - 2nd Predictor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction: College/University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EBI 2012-13 Results – Recommendations

#### Overall Learning Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Learning Factors</th>
<th>Impact on Overall Learning</th>
<th>Contribution to the Total Impact</th>
<th>Factor Performance</th>
<th>Recommendation Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Impact Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Manage Time, Study, Solve Problems</td>
<td>1st Predictor</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>Below Goal (5.01)</td>
<td>Top Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Personal Interactions</td>
<td>2nd Predictor</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>Below Goal (5.28)</td>
<td>Top Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Sense of Community</td>
<td>3rd Predictor</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>Below Goal (6.17)</td>
<td>Top Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Fellow Residents are Respectful</td>
<td>4th Predictor</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>Below Goal (5.31)</td>
<td>Top Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/Low Impact Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Diverse Interactions</td>
<td>5th Predictor</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>Below Goal (5.45)</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Personal Growth</td>
<td>Non Predictor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Below Goal (5.53)</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Fellow Residents are Tolerant</td>
<td>Non Predictor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Above Goal (7.73)</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EBI 2012-13 Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Impact Factors</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Interactions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emphasize floor events more; improve roommate relations with Get To Know You guide; revise hall gov’t to leadership council model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage Time, Study, Solve Problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spring semester all halls do a time management program; LCAs focus on creating study groups and training includes learning styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow Residents are Respectful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Roommate relations resources; consistency in policy enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Emphasize floor events more; Required floor program in Sept and Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Assignment or Change Process</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>New housing assignment system; implemented lottery for single rooms and summer wait list for reassignment requests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Survey Says!

![Survey Participants Image](image-url)
NASPA Consortium 2013-14

• 21 institutions; WMU 3% of overall responses
• Sample of 605 on- and off-campus residents
• Assessment Focus: impact of on-campus living and programming; impact of student staff experience

Participating institutions:
Alvernia University
Bowling Green State University
Clarion University
Eastern Connecticut State University
Emporia State University
Loyola University-New Orleans
Mount St. Mary's University
North Dakota State University
Southern Connecticut State University
Southern Utah University
University of Alabama
University of Connecticut
University of Florida
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
University of New Haven
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of Texas-Pan American
University of Texas-San Antonio
Wake Forest University
West Chester University
Western Michigan University

NASPA Consortium 2013-14 Results
NASPA Consortium 2013-14 Results

As a result of Res Life programs...

- My stress management skills have improved.
- My study skills have improved.
- My academic achievement and grades have improved.
- I have gained experience/skills relevant to my future career.
- My time management skills have improved.
- I have gained experience/skills relevant to my academic major.
- My critical thinking/problem solving skills have improved.
- My involvement in residence life programming and events has provided...
- My understanding of diverse perspectives has changed.
- I am better able to articulate my values, attitudes, and beliefs.
- I am better able to manage conflict.
- I have learned to balance social activities with academic obligations (e.g.,...
- My communication skills have improved.
- I am more willing to try new things/attend new programs.
- I feel part of the campus community.
- I have a greater sense of personal responsibility.
- I became aware of a campus resource or service with which I was not...
- I have been able to meet individuals with different interests from my own.
- I have been able to meet individuals with similar interests to my own.

WMU also topped the national average for being described as a respectful and welcoming environment.

1. True
2. False
WMU also topped the national average for being described as a respectful and welcoming environment.

1. True
2. False

- **Respectful** 3.21 / 3.36 → -0.15 mean difference
  - Statistically notable for Frosh, Juniors, Seniors

- **Welcoming** 3.24 / 3.33 → -0.09
  - Statistically notable for Soph, Seniors

### NASPA Consortium 2013-14 Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>National Average - All Answers</th>
<th>WMU - All Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity/culture</td>
<td>52.35%</td>
<td>60.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life experiences</td>
<td>49.90%</td>
<td>53.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>33.62%</td>
<td>41.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic (where people grow up)</td>
<td>43.52%</td>
<td>40.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>30.45%</td>
<td>36.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/spirituality</td>
<td>33.07%</td>
<td>31.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21.73%</td>
<td>30.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic status/class</td>
<td>32.17%</td>
<td>30.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>19.86%</td>
<td>25.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political views</td>
<td>27.04%</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice/oppression and privilege</td>
<td>15.36%</td>
<td>17.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not learned more about diversity since living on campus/in the res halls.</td>
<td>15.93%</td>
<td>13.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>14198</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**NASPA Consortium 2013-14 Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What We Learned</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff programming is impactful</td>
<td>Programming model, training are good; rationale for programming affirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning stress management techniques one of our lower mean scores for programming impact (3.51)</td>
<td>Challenged staff to shift more to teaching techniques than one-time fun events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% of WMU students say they don’t go to programs because they are shy</td>
<td>Discussed program promotion and recruitment techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful and welcoming environment below national norm</td>
<td>Keep this in mind beyond Fall Welcome and the start of the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences between the RA and LCA experience</td>
<td>Using results in marketing, staff developments regarding what you get from the experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmarking provides...**

- Different lens with which to view what you do
- Self-selected comparison groups and national norm
- Easily digestible data
- Valuable in setting priorities

Doesn’t need to be annual...can be pricey

Laura Darrah
Assessment In Action
April 3, 2015
Remaining Relevant

Using Data to Tell Your Story

Kate Bates, Student Activities and Leadership Programs

Our Story

Asking the Hard Questions
Self-study/External Review
Data Sitting on the Shelf
Collaborators
Selling The Story

- Develop a Marketing Plan
- Target all Stakeholders
- Utilize your Students

“Benefits of SALP” Orientation video

SALP BY THE NUMBERS

3.55 AVG. GPA

70% INCREASE

133 RSOs ATTENDED IN 2015

83% CAB

29.7% STUDENT LEADERSHIP

74% Every leader starts somewhere

84.8% FALC

74.2% FTE

63.3% FTE

55.6% FTE

“SALP By the Numbers” marketing flyer
"Like us Now, Love us Later"
Facebook campaign

It’s a Neverending Story...